



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,022	07/14/2003	Elazar Katz	BB010	6401
7590 Unisys Corporation Attn: Lise A. Rode Unisys Way, MS/E8-114 Blue Bell, PA 19424-0001			EXAMINER VYAS, ABHISHEK	
			ART UNIT 3691	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/17/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/619,022

Applicant(s)

KATZ ET AL.

Examiner

ABHISHEK VYAS

Art Unit

3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the amendment and remarks filed on 06/19/2008
2. Claims 1, 5-7, 9-17, 19-20 and 22 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-23 are currently pending and have been examined.
4. Claims 1-23 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, filed 06/19/2008 with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-23 under Lawrence US Patent No.: 7,181,428 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
8. In particular, claim 1 recites in the preamble "An anti-money laundering system for providing risk assessment determinations", the body of the claim does not contain any limitations indicating the structure of the device. A system or an apparatus claim should always claim the structure or the hardware that performs the function. Applicant's claimed limitations consist of modules (software according to the specification) that do not describe the structure of the device. Appropriate correction is required.

9. Claim 12, recites a method for the performing the steps set forth in the claims, however, it unclear as to how such steps are being performed without being tied to a statutory apparatus. It is also unclear in claims 14 and 19 how the nature of customers is identified? nature to be broadly interpreted will be considered a relative term in association with identification of customers.
10. Claims 2-11, and 13-23 are rejected on their dependencies to claim 1 and 12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

11. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

12. Claim 1-11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
13. Claim 1 recites in the preamble "a computer for displaying a result to a user, the result being provided by a calculation scale framework for use in an electronic commerce environment comprising a computer network, the electronic commerce environment defining a calculation rule, and a set of commerce objects, the computer system comprising." The body of claim 24 recites "code means" for each limitation. Therefore claim 1 is non-statutory because it is directed towards software, per se, lacking storage on a medium, which enables any underlying functionality to occur. It is not clear whether instructions are in executable form and therefore there is no practical application.
14. Claims 2-11 are rejected for their dependency on claim 1.
15. Claims 12-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
16. Claims 12-23 recite a process comprising the steps of identifying, assigning, identifying, determining, performing and providing. Based on Supreme Court precedent, a proper process must be tied to another statutory class or transform underlying subject matter to a different state

or thing (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)). Since neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not considered a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. 101. To qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplished the method steps or positively reciting the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. Claim 12 at issue does not use an apparatus and does not describe process of manufacture or process for alteration of composition of matter, and since claim instead cover use of mental processes to solve the step of identifying, assigning, identifying, determining, performing and providing and thus seek to patent use of human intelligence in and of itself.

17. Claims 13-23 are rejected for their dependency to claim 12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. **Claims 1-23** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawrence United States Patent No. 7,181,428 in view of Lawrence United States Patent Application Publication No.: 2003/0177087 (herein after Lawrence '087)

19. **As per claim 1**, Lawrence discloses the following limitations:

- a risk assessor module for providing to an authorized user of the anti-money-laundering system, guidelines in identifying risks associated with potential money laundering transactions processed by the branch of the financial institution (see at

least Lawrence column 1, lines 14-27; column 2, lines 58-67; column 3, lines 13-22 and 65-67; column 4, lines 47-50; column 5, lines 16-30).

- a policy builder module for recommending possible electronic and manual countermeasures to the risks identified by the risk assessor module and for enabling the authorized user to select the countermeasures of his choice in order to create a policy for the branch of the financial institution (see at least Lawrence column 2, lines 40-42; column 3, lines 3-12).
- an account opening due diligence module for providing detailed recommendations to the authorized user as to whether to allow an application for an account at the branch of the financial institution and for applying consistent implementation of the policy throughout the branch of the financial institution; (see at least Lawrence column 2, lines 38-40; and lines 53-62).

Lawrence does not specifically disclose the following limitation. Lawrence '087, however, teaches the limitations as follows:

- a transaction activity monitor module for receiving and monitoring transaction information including transaction information received by the account opening due diligence module, and for identifying suspicious patterns among the transactions at the branch of the financial institution in order to provide a suspicious transaction activity report; related to potential money laundering transaction processed by (see at least Lawrence '087 paragraphs 0008-0010, 0022-0024, 0028, 0040-0042, 0047, 0065, 0068-71).
- a case management and reporting module for tracking and identifying the detailed recommendations of the account opening due diligence module in order to provide continuous feedback to the authorized user about the effectiveness of the 25 system (see at least Lawrence'087 paragraphs 0028-0029, 0046, 0068-0069).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system of Lawrence with Lawrence '087 to monitor transactions and high

risk transactions to prevent money laundering and associated liabilities (see at least Lawrence column 3, lines 18-22; column 4, lines 44-55; column 5, lines 22-30; column 6, lines 35-40; column 8, lines 44-48; Lawrence '087 paragraphs 0006, 0008).

20. As per claim 2, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- a staff training and policy management module for using the selected countermeasures to develop customized training programs and to track compliance of users of the anti-money-laundering system (see at least Lawrence column 3, lines 65-67; column 4, lines 47-55).

21. As per claim 3, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- the risk assessor module comprise geographic location risk, types of customers served, and types of services offered by the financial institution (see at least Lawrence column 1, lines 56-60; column 4, lines 56-67; column 5, lines 34-36 and column 8, lines 16-24).

22. As per claim 4, Lawrence discloses the limitation as follows:

- the policy builder module provides detailed support for the decision process in creating the policy (see at least Lawrence column 6, lines 33-40; column 7, lines 1-9).

23. As per claim 5, Lawrence discloses following limitation:

- the authorized user can override for the branch of the financial institution, the detailed recommendations provided by the account opening due diligence module (see at least Lawrence column 5, lines 42-50).

24. As per claim 6, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- the transaction information received and monitored by the transaction activity monitor further comprise historical data (see at least Lawrence column 5, lines 66-67; column 6, line 1).

25. As per claim 7, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- the transaction information received and monitored by the transaction activity monitor further comprises input from employees of the branch of the financial institution (see at least Lawrence column 3, line 65; column 4, lines 5-18).

26. **As per claim 8**, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- the case management and reporting module tracks and identifies the detailed recommendations of the account opening due diligence module that are overridden by the authorized user, and updates the account opening due diligence module based on the override (see at least Lawrence column 3, lines 3-5, lines 18-22; column 5, line 42-50).

27. **As per claim 9**, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- the risks identified by the risk assessor module are used to determine the level of review applied against a selected operation or transaction (see at least Lawrence column 3, lines 23-27; column 4, line 19-31, lines 47-50).

28. **As per claim 10**, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- the level of review is selected from the group consisting of standard review or special review (see at least Lawrence column 8, lines 39-41).

29. **As per claim 11**, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- the system is communicatively coupled to an electronic network including a plurality of databases, and wherein the transaction activity monitor component gathers information stored on the plurality of databases in order to monitor the suspicious transactions, and processes the information to output the risk assessment guidelines and an explanation of the risk assessment guidelines (see at least Lawrence column 8, lines 7-15).

30. **As per claim 12**, Lawrence discloses the following limitation:

- identifying risk dimensions associated with potential money laundering transactions processed by the branch of a financial institution (see at least Lawrence column 1, lines 14-25).

- assigning numerical designations for the risk dimensions identified for the a branch of a financial institution (see at least Lawrence column 5, lines 15-21; column 6, lines 33-40).
- providing to an authorized user recommended guidelines for handling the financial transaction to be conducted, based on the special risk assessment procedure (see at least Lawrence column 9, lines 15-32).
- determining whether the numerical designation of at least a selected one of the identified risk dimensions for the financial transaction to be conducted exceeds a predetermined level, if the financial transaction to be conducted does have a risk-related dimension (see at least Lawrence column 5, lines 22-30; column 8, lines 44-48).

Lawrence does not specifically disclose the following limitations Lawrence'087, however teaches, the following limitations:

- identifying a type of financial transaction to be conducted at the branch of a financial institution (see at least Lawrence '087 paragraphs 008-0010, 0022-0024).
- determining whether a financial transaction to be conducted has a risk-related dimension (see at least Lawrence '087 paragraphs 0040-0042, 0047, 0065).
- performing a special risk assessment procedure when the numerical designation of at least a selected one of the identified risk dimensions exceeds a predetermined level (see at least Lawrence '087 paragraphs 0040-0042, 0047, 0065)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the system of Lawrence with Lawrence '087 to monitor transactions and high risk transactions to prevent money laundering and associated liabilities (see at least Lawrence column 5, lines 22-30; column 6, lines 35-40; column 8, lines 44-48; Lawrence '087 paragraphs 0006, 0008).

31. As per claim 13, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- performing a standard risk assessment procedure if the numerical designation of none of the identified risk dimensions exceeds a predetermined level (see at least Lawrence column 9, lines 20-23).

32. As per claim 14, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- a first risk dimension representing a risks due to a location of the branch of the financial institution (see at least Lawrence column 8, lines: 18-24; 44-45; 59-61).
- a second risk dimension representing the risks due to selected services offered by the branch of a financial institution (see at least Lawrence column 8, lines 44-45; lines 64-67; column 9, lines 1-14).
- a third risk dimension representing the risks due to an identified nature of the customers served by the branch of the financial institution (see at least Lawrence column 8, lines 44-45, 53-58).
- a fourth risk dimension representing the risks due to a particular jurisdiction served by branch of a financial institution (see at least Lawrence column 5, lines 53-56; column 7, lines 54-67).

33. As per claim 15, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- the risk dimensions are based on local laws, regulations, historical data, and other information that is specific to the branch of the financial institution (see at least Lawrence column 4, lines 32-36).

34. As per claim 16, Lawrence discloses the following limitation:

- each of the selected services has associated accounts, each of the associated accounts having a risk rating and risk exposure rating, and wherein each risk dimension is based on a risk rating and a risk exposure rating of all associated accounts of all of the selected services (see at least Lawrence column 2, lines 34-42; column 5, lines 38-42; column 6, lines 35-40).

35. As per claim 17, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- the second and the third risk dimensions are based on data collected from the selected services (see at least Lawrence column 4, lines 5-18; column 7, lines 54-67; column 8, lines 1-15).

36. As per claim 18, Lawrence discloses the following limitation:

- performing a standard risk assessment procedure if it is determined that the financial transaction to be conducted does not have a risk-related dimension, wherein the standard risk assessment is based on the average of the numerical designation for all of the risks (see at least Lawrence column 6, lines 35-38; column 9, lines 59-62).

37. As per claim 19, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- the type of financial transaction to be conducted at the branch of a financial institution comprises opening an account, and wherein the risk dimension for the account opening is based on the risk due to the identified nature of the customers served by the branch of the financial institution (see at least Lawrence column 5, lines 36-42).

38. As per claim 20, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- wherein the nature of the customers served by the branch of the financial institution includes high-risk clientele, and wherein the special risk assessment procedure is performed for the account opening (see at least Lawrence column 1, lines 11-13, lines 30-43; column 2, lines 53-55).

39. As per claim 21, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- when it is determined to perform a special risk assessment procedure for a financial transaction, the special risk assessment procedure is performed semi-annually, and wherein when it is determined to perform a standard risk assessment procedure for a financial transaction, the standard risk assessment procedure is performed annually (see at least Lawrence column 3, lines 65-67; column 6, lines 14-18).

40. As per claim 22, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- overriding by an authorized user the recommended guidelines for handling the financial transaction to be conducted (see at least Lawrence column 5, lines 42-50).

41. **As per claim 23**, Lawrence teaches the following limitation:

- the authorized user provides alternative guidelines after the step of overriding the recommended guidelines for handling the financial transaction to be conducted (see at least Lawrence column 5, lines 51-56; column 6, lines 20-23).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abhishek Vyas whose telephone number is 571-270-1836. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm EST Mon-Thur, ALT Friday OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Abhishek Vyas/
Examiner, Art Unit 3691

/Lalita M Hamilton/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691